

JUN 07 2001

DON HANCOCK: My name is Don Hancock, H-a-n-c-o-c-k. I'm with Southwest Research and Information Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. I'm one of these people who also come a long way tonight, but part of the message is not only to thank people from Pahrump and people from Nevada who have been fighting, effectively I might say, the Yucca Mountain project for a number years, but to, with  
1 Chris and some of the other people who have spoken, say there are, in fact, a lot of other people around the country who are fighting and will continue to fight with Nevadans against Yucca Mountain, against the site, against these repositories. They make no sense.

And people around the nation need to understand that and can understand that, and so your opposition is extremely important and you need to keep it up, and some of the rest of us will try to work with you and help you.

2 One of the things that's curious to me as an outsider from New Mexico is in looking at this issue of the comment period it's kind of a no-brainer. Obviously you need more time. I compare it to the comment period that you had after some controversy on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The last administration, as bad it was, gave longer comment periods than it appears that this administration is going to give you. And if that's the case that should send people a message in Nevada about how your views on these important issues are actually going to be considered if they don't even want to give you time to comment on these things.

3 I'm one of these people, and I want to pick up on a point that Willie just made about wasting money. I'm one of those unfortunate millions of people around the country who gets hit twice. I'm unfortunately, against my opposition, and a lot of other people, I live in New Mexico and part of my electric utility bills go to the Public Service Company of New Mexico and the Arizona Public Service to pay into the waste fund, so some of this money that's being used, wasted, on Yucca Mountain comes out of my pocket in the form of my electric rate bills every month. And then as a taxpayer of course we pay for the defense part of it. So an incredible amount of money is being wasted. It should be stopped.

Unfortunately it's not only the seven billion that's already been spent, but the Department of Energy's documents talk about \$57 billion that they want to spend long-term on this. So this isn't the way to do it.

What the Department of Energy should be doing is to say enough is enough. We've wasted enough money on Yucca Mountain. We know the site is bad. Let's stop wasting our money on it and save that money to use for -- even the waste fund money could be used better than this.

4 So that would be my recommendation actually that what the Department of Energy should be doing is to not  
only stop what they're doing in terms of the draft impact statements, supplements, recommendations, they  
should stop all of that and just say we know that Yucca Mountain is a bad site. Let's stop doing it.

5 This is actually a good time to do it because in essence this document, the draft supplement, essentially  
admits that. Because it admits it because it says we've got to develop totally new waste packages. We've  
got to develop drip shields. We've got to develop a mechanism that we have been told for 20 years would  
not be needed.

6 The Department of Energy tells us that this increases the costs by \$7.1 billion. That's their system life cycle  
cost document released in May of 2001, the same time the draft supplement was. And so the conclusion  
should be, huh, Yucca Mountain doesn't work. We've got to spend extra money. We've got to try to  
continue to figure out a design to try to make it work. Well, there's a better solution. Just admit it doesn't  
work and let's stop. Flexible designs don't make any sense.

7 Another bad idea is Yucca Mountain is supposed to be a repository, not a surface storage facility, not having  
spent fuel pools, storage pools. So once again that's another admission that the site doesn't work, and so we  
want to use the site for something that is not what a repository is supposed to do.

8 Another thing that's no surprise to me that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has looked at calculations  
9 and would find errors, part of what's going on as a number of people have said is DOE was in a rush. And  
so just cursorily looking, for example at the lifecycle document that talks about an increase of \$7.1 billion  
for the waste packages, and then when you look at the waste package section on 3-8 it says, The quantity of  
waste packages is decreased over the 1998 estimates from 15,706 to 14,768. You compare that to what's in  
this document (indicating) issued at the at the same time which talks about 17,000 waste packages.

So on the one time DOE is saying the cost are going up because we're using more expensive packages and  
drip shields but fewer of them, and then we have a Draft Environmental Impact Statement that says, but  
we're going to need 17,000 of them, so they aren't even checking their own numbers for internal consistency.

10 That gives you an example of how good the technical work is they're doing when they can't even make their  
own documents released at the same time consistent with each other. So if that's the kind of science you  
want to trust, I would say no, don't. But let's have a scientist make the proper decision, which is to say let's  
walk away from this mountain and stop.

Thank you very much.